

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/710,625	CUSICK, NICHOLAS J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mike Chambers	3711	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Mike Chambers. (3) Randall Schwartz.
 (2) Andrew Colombo. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 August 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 27 and 35.

Identification of prior art discussed: See prior OfficeAction.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1) Discused instant invention and the proposed claims.
2) Discussed the addition of orthogonal limitations in the claim language

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.


A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.



UNIVERSITY OF
NEBRASKA
LINCOLN

Department of Mechanical Engineering
N104 Walter Scott Engineering Center
P.O. Box 880656
Lincoln, NE 68588-0656
(402) 472-2375
FAX (402) 472-1465

Engineering Report

To: Nick Cusik
Bison, Inc.
603 L St.
Lincoln, NE 68508

From: Brent Wilson
Mechanical Engineering Department
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0656

Date: April 29, 2004

Description: Bahore Resiliency and Density Testing of Foam

The University of Nebraska was contacted to conduct testing in order to determine the Bashore impact resiliency of certain foams manufactured at Bison, Inc. After a preliminary literature review to ascertain the specifics of this testing method, an ASTM standard was found that outlines the procedure used to perform this test. ASTM standard D2362 describes a testing method in which a mass is dropped onto a foam sample and the height of rebound is measured. The ratio of the rebound height to the starting height is designated as the resiliency.

After the construction of a testing device, sixteen samples were tested in accordance with this method. In order to get accurate data, the tests were videotaped using a Sony digital camcorder. The video was fed into a computer and analyzed in slow motion. The results of the testing are shown in Table 1.

Sample	Description	Test 1	Test 2	Test 3	AVG
1	BA58	21	22	20	21.0
2	BA68U - Skin Side	51	51		51.0
3	BA68U - Interior Foam	39	40	39	39.3
4	BA48U - Skin Side	51	51	52	51.3
5	BA48U - Interior Foam	43	40	41	41.3
6	SC44PP - Side #1	50	48	49	49.0
7	SC44PP - Side #2	50	50	50	50.0
8	BA62U - Side #1	42	41	42	41.7
9	BA62U - Side #2	44	45	44	44.3
10	BA62U - Interior Foam	41	40	41	40.7
11	SCOOPP - w/ vinyl cover	21	21	21	21.0
12	SCOOPP - w/o vinyl cover	23	21	22	22.0
13	BA74 - w/ ethafoam and cover	32	30	31	31.0
14	BA74 - w/ ethafoam only	48	45	46	46.3
15	SC4OPP - Skin sample #1	40	42	42	41.3
16	SC4OPP - Skin sample #2	46	47	48	47.0

Table 1 - Bashore resiliency data for sixteen foam samples tested at the University of Nebraska. Value is the ratio of rebound height to starting height.

In order to determine if there was a correlation between the density of certain foam materials and the resiliency, density measurements were taken on samples BA58, BA68U, SCOOPP, and SC40PP. A plot of density vs. resiliency is shown in Figure 1. Notice that increasing density does correspond to an increase in resiliency. However, the increase is not a linear function. For this small sample size, the resiliency increases as a step function where around 0.2g/ml the resiliency increases. This data is not conclusive and more samples would need to be examined to determine a definite result.




Figure 1 - Density vs. Bashore resiliency for four foam samples tested at the University of Nebraska.